



Regional Airport Planning Committee

June 11, 2008

TO: Regional Airport Planning Committee
FROM: Staff of the Regional Airport Planning Committee

SUBJECT: Draft Minutes of March 28, 2008 Regional Airport Planning Committee Meeting

1. **Call to Order.** The meeting was called to order by Chair Garbarino at 9:35 A.M.
2. **Roll Call.** Present were: Garbarino (ABAG), Bates (BCDC), Blanchard (MTC), Chu (MTC), Greene (SJC), Hauri (General Aviation), McKenney (OAK), Novak (FAA), Peskin (San Francisco County), Salmon (ABAG), Martin (SFO), and Spring (MTC).
3. **Staff Announcements.** None.
4. **Chair Announcements.** The Chair announced that the next RAPC meeting will be held on June 27, 2008.
5. **Public Comment Period.** None.
6. **Minutes, Meeting Of January 25, 2008.** Motion was made to approve the minutes of RAPC's January 25, 2008 meeting. Motion passed unanimously.
7. **Presentations by General Aviation Airports (Agenda Item No. 4).** Chris Brittle introduced Jon Stout, Airport Director at Charles Schulz Airport located in the City of Santa Rosa in Sonoma County, Martin Pehl, Airport Director for Napa County Airports and Committee member Leander Hauri, Airport Director for Livermore Airport in Alameda County.

Jon Stout provided an overview of operations and planning at Charles Schulz Airport in Sonoma County. Mr. Stout described the recent return of commercial service at the airport after a five year absence of such service. He stated that Horizon Air has been successful at the airport, starting out with three flights a day and expanding that number to six flights. Horizon currently serves Portland, Los Angeles and Seattle and carried 133,000 passengers, which was better than they had anticipated and the success has led them to amend their agreement to allow up to 10 daily departures and add service to San Diego.

Mr. Stout described the airport by saying that the terminal facilities are a little inadequate to serve the new flights and that the airport is working to improve the terminal. He said that parking is filling up and that the airport will add more parking to serve the new commercial service.

Mr. Stout explained that the airport staff is in the process of updating the Master Plan for the airport, which includes a runway extension from 5,100 to 6,000 feet and a 50,000 square foot terminal facility. He stated that the runway extension will allow the airport to accommodate regional jets that could serve Denver and Salt Lake City and that Delta and United Airlines have both expressed interest in providing this service once the runway is lengthened to accommodate the jets.

Mr. Stout stated that the Master Plan forecasts 15 to 16 departures a day by 2030 and 600,000 passengers per year. The Sonoma County General Plan limits the number of daily commercial flights to 21 departures and the demand is not there to support a larger number of daily flights.

Mr. Stout described the general aviation operations at the airport stating that there are currently 128,000 operations, 400 based aircraft, a large corporate presence and flight training, which is down to two training schools. He also said that the ILS system at the airport was being upgraded to help in foggy conditions.

He summed up by saying that the airport does have some capacity and could take more traffic up to the 21 flights a day that are within the County's General Plan limits. He said that the airport is a good regional alternative, just not a large one.

Martin Pehl presented information on the two airports in Napa County, the Napa County Airport and a smaller airport that is located in Angwin. He stated that the primary airport is surrounded by industrial land, light commercial and warehouses and that the County has pushed industrial uses around the airport making for a compatible land use arrangement. He described one compatibility challenge that involves the rail lines that serve the industrial uses and runs across the single airport access road at grade creating a conflict with automobiles and trains. The County is currently trying to find a way to provide a second access road into the airport to reduce the impact of this conflict.

Mr. Pehl stated that the County was developing a new Master Plan for the airport that the Board of Supervisors would review in April of 2008. He described the Master Plan and said that it included the extension of a runway that would connect both runways and would enhance runway safety. He stated that local general aviation has really dropped off over the last decade, that itinerant is flat and that there has been a big increase in corporate activity. He said that there is a flight training school that is operated by Japan Airlines that runs a training center that it sends all of its pilots to for training.

He described the County's plan for property acquisition to provide approach protection. He also described a US Fish and Wildlife determination that the airport property included critical habitat for the fairy shrimp. He explained that this determination has been questioned and that the property is very disturbed and only contains one vernal pool, but the size of the habitat area identified by US Fish and Wildlife is much larger.

Leander Hauri presented information on the Livermore Airport operations and planning. His powerpoint presentation is available at BCDC's website at bcdca.gov and MTC's website at mtc.ca.gov.

A Committee member asked what the land uses were around Charles Schulz Airport.

Mr. Stout responded that the land uses consist mostly of rural residential and one industrial park which is a pretty good mix to have around an airport. He said that the area has a strong ALUC and a good land use plan that is protective of the airport.

A Committee member asked if the airport has policies in place to prevent concentrated residential development around the airport and Mr. Stout replied that there were such policies.

Mr. Blanchard asked Mr. Stout about the potential for Charles Schulz Airport to provide more service if the General Plan did not contain a ceiling of 21 flights per day.

Mr. Stout explained that he was not the appropriate person to address the question, as it dealt with political issues. However, if you removed the political issues and looked at it as purely an airport capacity question, then the airport could accommodate 230,000 operations per year without needing a third runway. He said that they are currently forecasting 170,000 operations by 2030, so the airport would still have capacity beyond this point if the airport terminal were to be increased to 80,000 square feet and include up to nine gates. He explained that this would amount to 40 commercial flights per day. He stated that he was unsure if the parking they were planning would accommodate this number of flights or if the market demand would ever support that number. He said that from an access perspective, the airport's location, about a mile and half from Highway 101 and seven miles north of downtown Santa Rosa, was going to improve once Highway 101 was widened through Santa Rosa and that access would be adequate. He summarized by saying that there a lot of opportunities at the airport subject to the Board's approval.

Mr. Blanchard asked if it was accurate that in order to realize 40 flights a day or even the current target of 21 flights a day, that the airport needs to expand one runway, expand the terminal and move the tower.

Mr. Stout answered that this was accurate and that the cost of this project is \$65 million and would necessitate the purchase of 25 acres, but that it is more about money for the airport than about land.

Mr. Blanchard asked what 40 flights a day meant to the region in terms of off loading from the three main commercial airports.

Mr. Martin responded that he thought that it did make a difference and when everything is taken together, it is an important component to managing demand. He went on to state that the one percent that the 40 flights a day going to the Sonoma County airport instead of SFO would likely account for more like two percent of flights for SFO because these flights at SFO would be in smaller aircraft moving less people on the same amount of runway space. He also noted that the diversion would also get people off of the freeway. He stated that if we realized these types of numbers at Stockton and Buchanan and Monterey that it could bring the diversion up to 10 percent which would be significant.

Mr. Blanchard asked if it was correct that at the Livermore Airport, there is not going to be an option for commercial flights there unless the City Council made that change.

Mr. Hauri responded that that was accurate.

Mr. Greene asked what the significance was of expanding the runway from 5,100 to 6,000 feet and that it did not sound like a lot and if there was a possibility to go further.

Mr. Stout responded that the county has done surveys to identify what is needed to accommodate the regional jets that the airlines want to use in a market of Sonoma County's size and that 6,000 feet would allow the airport to accommodate flights to markets as far away as Houston, Denver and Vancouver. He stated that this was as comfortable as the Board was willing to go.

Public Comment for Item No. 4. There were no public comments for the item.

8. **Committee Consideration of Staff Recommendation for a letter to the Federal Aviation Administration on the FAA's Proposed Rates and Changes Policy (Agenda Item No. 5).** Chris Brittle presented the staff recommendation to the Committee. The Committee unanimously approved staff's recommendation. A copy of the staff report is available at both the BCDC and the MTC websites at www.bcdc.ca.gov or www.mtc.ca.gov.

Public Comment for Item No. 5. There were no public comments for the item.

9. **Staff Recommendation Regarding Expansion of the Regional Airport Planning Committee to Include Representatives of Stockton, Monterey and Sacramento Airports (Agenda Item No. 6).** Lindy Lowe presented the staff recommendation regarding the Committee's expansion to include representatives from Stockton, Monterey and Sacramento Counties.

Mr. Spering stated that he felt that it was appropriate to have representation from these airports but that he did not support them having any voting rights at all and that such rights would create a problem because there are representatives on the Committee that represent this region and there is accountability to the region. He said that he thought that they should select who represents them, whether it be an airport director or an elected official or some other representative.

Mr. Peskin stated that his fear would be that the new members would be less likely to attend the meetings if they did not have some voting rights. He said that he agreed with Mr. Spering that the counties should decide who should represent them, although there are benefits to an elected official. He said that he would be inclined to offer the carrot of a vote on items that will directly affect their counties.

Mr. Martin stated that he has talked to Tom Greer of the Monterey Airport and that he has an elected Board of Directors that he thinks would likely want to appoint a representative to RAPC and that he could serve as an alternate to his board member. He agreed with Mr. Peskin that having a vote was important and that given the size of the Committee he did not think that three new members would change the outcome of the votes.

Mr. Hauri agreed that the new members would be drawn in more if they had a vote.

Mr. Spering said that he could support a vote on issues that would directly affect their counties and that the concern he had is that if RAPC takes action on items such as expanding SFO, OAK or another Bay Area airport and that there is controversy around the vote and a swing vote comes from outside of the region. He stated that he was unsure how staff would decide what the issues are that the extra-regional members could vote on but that he could support them voting on items that would directly affect their airport or their county.

Ms. McKenney agreed saying that it was important for the airports in the nine county region that RAPC is indeed the body that is making the recommendations as opposed to those who are outside of the region and may have different motivations. She went on to say that since we do not know where Phase 2 or Phase 3 will lead and that it may result in a recommendation that Sacramento should do something, then it would be better if they were able to officially weigh in on those items.

Mr. Blanchard asked if staff could go back and remind the Committee the reason for recommending that RAPC expand to include these new members.

Ms. Lowe responded that the purpose for recommending that RAPC include these new representatives is because they are part of the mega-region and that Monterey and Stockton in particular send a lot of passenger traffic to SFO. She said that Sacramento is more of an established airport but that they had the potential to divert traffic from SFO or OAK. She stated that staff felt that these three commercial airports in the neighboring regions are tools in the tool

box for solving our congestion problems and that it would be awkward to talk about these airports in any detail without including representatives to be part of the discussion as a part of the Committee in some capacity. She asked if Mr. Martin had anything to add to the description.

Mr. Martin said that he really agreed with what was said and that the catchment areas for Stockton and Monterey overlap with the Bay Area airports and that 75% of the people who live on the Monterey Peninsula drive to SJC or SFO to reach their flights. He said that he thought Stockton sent about 50% out of their county to reach their flights.

Mr. Blanchard stated that this is a huge impact on both roads and airport infrastructure and that it would be advisable to have them at the table and to figure out how to direct them out of the Bay Area. He agreed with Mr. Spering on the issue of voting and said that he felt it was awkward to have them voting on a Committee that was designed to be representative of the nine county Bay Area region. He asked if it was possible to make them ex-officio members and if it is an item that affects them, then give them a vote on that item and if it is affecting the nine county Bay Area it is obvious that the vote should be limited to those invested and responsible to the communities that they are representing.

Mr. Bates asked what RAPC is hoping these members bring to the Committee-political expertise, technical expertise and said that this question is relevant to the issue of voting. He said that he felt like the mega-region is already here and if the Bay Area is receiving this kind of traffic from these counties then these counties should be at RAPC. He stated that he is happy to support the idea that they only vote on issues that affect them, but that everything affects them, even if it happens to occur within the Bay Area. He then asked if there were going to be some critical votes where these new members might decide the issue and stated that he was not aware of any highly controversial or divisive issues that might be coming before the Committee.

Ms. Lowe responded that there are benefits to both political and technical representation and that it was incredibly valuable to have the airport directors on the Committee to provide their technical and airport specific expertise when it is needed by the Committee. She then said that it is also important to have the elected officials here because airports and politics are intertwined and it is not possible to talk about airport planning and operations without elected officials on the Committee representing their constituents.

Mr. Bates asked how many members were currently on RAPC and if it made sense to appoint two representatives from each county, one from the airport and one elected official since it is important to have both. He stated that they should only have one vote between them but that since he learned a lot at the RAPC meetings where both types of representatives are present, then he would favor going to six new representatives.

Mr. Martin responded that as a staff person from the airport he felt that if he had an elected official at the table, as he does, he would make sure to follow the issues very closely and if he is Tom Greer in Monterey County he is going to make sure to read all of the documents and know exactly what is going on. He stated that he felt that one of the real benefits of having elected officials is for these officials to hear the direction that the Bay Area is taking and the reliance that will be placed on the outlying airports to handle more commercial traffic and to ensure that they see it coming and that they make the appropriate investments and the hard decisions about limiting development around their airports. He then described a situation that occurred in Stockton a couple of years ago where they turned down a commercial flight and he said that having them at the table while they were making that decision might have made a difference.

Mr. Peskin said that RAPC might base this membership on the way that BCDC's membership is based on different representatives having different kinds of votes and that staff should look to BCDC's governing documents for a model that would allow the new members to vote on some items but not on others.

A Committee member agreed with Mr. Bates on these adjacent counties now being part of the region and that region now includes Sacramento, Stockton and Monterey and that he would like to hear what these counties think about these issues and that ultimately elected officials will be the ones to make the decisions on what will happen at the airports.

Chair Garbarino asked if the representative from Stockton Metropolitan Airport would like to speak.

Steve Hicks, the Airport Director at Stockton Metropolitan Airport, stated that he felt that it was important that the representative be an elected official and that they would not fully understand the aviation issues and what the region is trying to do if they are not at the table. He said that he believed that Stockton Airport is part of the solution in the region and that the county wants to be here to support that planning and be a tool in the tool box. He said that he thought that one of the board members would be willing to sit on RAPC and attend the meetings and that he would still be here with that Board member to attend meetings and brief that official to make him aware of the issues.

Mr. Bates responded that he thought RAPC should ask each county to appoint a political representative because staff is going to have to come anyway and brief the official and be present to answer questions.

Mr. Sperring said that he still felt that each county should decide who represents them and that it would be accurate to say that RAPC's priority is to have an elected official that if they want to appoint someone else then it is up to them. He restated that he felt very strongly that their votes should be limited because RAPC has reviewed controversial issues before and there have been times when the BCDC representatives have voted one way because of their policies and MTC another way. He explained that as a county supervisor he did not want another neighboring supervisor voting on issues within his county and that even taking the mega-region into account he felt that there were items that were germane to the nine county Bay Area. He said that he hoped that staff would come up with a way to include them and give them the ability to vote on the mega-regional issues and encourage them to appoint an elected official and the opportunity to appoint an airport director or someone else as an alternate.

Chair Garbarino asked Mr. Sperring if he wanted to direct staff to look into this further and bring it back to the Committee.

Mr. Sperring responded that staff may have enough direction and that he believed that there was consensus on expanding to include these members.

Mr. Blanchard said that the thought occurred to him that if RAPC limited the voting rights of the new members, then would those representing the nine-county Bay Area be able to vote on those items that occurred outside of the nine-counties.

Mr. Novak said that he felt that RAPC should include within their analysis on this issue the fact that the aviation network has different boundaries and that the legal definition of the nine-county Bay Area does not reflect the Bay Area's aviation network boundaries which include Sacramento, Stockton and Monterey. He stated that it is important to explain that RAPC is allowing people outside of the Bay Area to participate because the aviation network has very different boundaries and that these areas are part of the Bay Area aviation system.

Mr. Bates asked if staff is looking for a vote today.

Ms. Lowe responded that staff is looking for the Committee to take action today. She said that one way the Committee could approach the item is to agree on a direction and staff could then craft draft MOU language that would be brought back to the Committee and would allow for the Committee to get into the details of that language.

Mr. Bates responded that this concept sounded good to him and that he appreciated Mr. Novak's comment that the region is larger for aviation purposes than our current political boundaries and that RAPC should think about organizing itself around this reality.

Mr. Chu said that he would like to direct staff to continue on this path and to draft an amendment to the MOU and invite the representatives from these counties to come to the next meeting so that they can be part of the discussion prior to the final vote.

Mr. Peskin suggested that the Committee should do this in several phases. He described Phase 1 as inviting the counties to participate in an ex-officio capacity and to sit at the table and be part of the conversation and that Phase 2 would be the time when RAPC figured out how to include them regarding voting rights. He said that he would be very happy to make a motion that RAPC would prefer each county to appoint an elected official, but that it is up to each jurisdiction who they want to appoint. He stated that they would begin in an ex-officio, non-voting capacity and that RAPC would consider steps to expanding the voting with these representatives present as the Committee makes these decisions.

The motion was unanimously approved by the Committee.

Public Comment for Item No. 6. No public comment.

10. Staff Update on the Phase 2 Task Force (Agenda Item No. 7). Lindy Lowe provided an update on the Phase 2 Task Force saying that the first Task Force meeting will be held on May 23, 2008 from 10 a.m. to Noon at BCDC's offices in San Francisco. She said that staff sent out material to the Task Force to provide them with a framework for understanding RAPC's current work, including RAPC's three-phase work program, the Phase 2 work plan and the FAA's FACT 2 report. She said that staff would be working with the consultants prior to the Task Force meeting to develop a plan for facilitating the meeting and orienting the members at their first meeting.

Public Comment for Item No. 7. No public comment.

11. Staff Update on the Request for Qualifications for Phase 2 (Agenda Item No. 8). Chris Brittle provided the Committee with an update on the selection of a consultant for the Phase 2 work. He explained that only one team responded to the RFP and that staff, with the addition of Danielle Rinsler from SFO and Keith Freitas from Buchanan Airport, reviewed the proposal and determined that the team was well-qualified to do the Phase 2 work. He said that the lead consultant was SH&E, headquartered in Cambridge, Massachusetts and are a well known international firm with a very strong airport practice with experience in regional aviation planning, including the New England regional airport study. He described their experience further saying that they have looked at demand management strategies for the New York area and structured the nation's only demand management pricing program for Boston Logan. He said that the proposal included a strong public process team that will include a research firm that will conduct a telephone poll early on in Phase 2. He said that staff is currently in contract negotiations with SH&E.

Public Comment for Item No. 7. No public comment.

12. Scheduling of Next Meeting, Adjournment. The next monthly meeting of RAPC will be held on June 27, 2008 at the MetroCenter Auditorium in Oakland.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:55 a.m.